

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 10-13, 15 and 17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended and new claims 18 and 19 have been added. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 3-9, 14, 16, 18 and 19 would be pending. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Thus, entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

**II. Objection to Abstract of the Disclosure**

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the relationship between two wavelengths in the abstract is not defined. By this Amendment, the abstract has been amended to describe the relationship between two wavelengths. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ouchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,626,540, hereinafter Ouchi).

**1. Claims 1 and 14:**

Claims 1 and 14, as amended, is directed to an arrangement in which a light component, in a wavelength region between the  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ , of light incident on the polarization splitting surface includes more S-polarized light than P-polarized light.

On the contrary, in Ouchi, the light in the wavelength region between S1 and S2, shown in Fig.16C, is made incident on the polarization splitting surface 105RB of the color splitting/combining optical system shown in Fig. 9 as “P-polarized light”. Thus, Ouchi does not appear to disclose or suggest at least that the light component, in a wavelength region between the  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ , of light incident on the polarization splitting surface includes more S-polarized light than P-polarized light. Accordingly, claims 1 and 14 and their dependent claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited reference.

As to newly added claims 18 and 19, these dependent claims further recite that  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ . Ouchi discloses “S1 > S2” in Fig. 16C, which at best may correspond to “ $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$ ”. However, Ouchi does not disclose or suggest “ $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ ” as recited in claims 18 and 19. Accordingly, new claims 18 and 19 are further distinguishable over the cited reference.

## **2. Claims 10 and 15:**

Claims 10 through 13, 15 and 17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

## **IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 10-13, 15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mihalakis. (U.S. Patent No. 6,375,330).

Claims 10-13, 15, 17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering these rejections moot.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5349.


In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5349.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

3/2/06

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
James Hwa  
Registration No. 42,680  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101